

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE .	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/893,209	09/19/2001	Song Kim	7091-103/10102873	5641
7590 03/02/2007 FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P. 29th Floor 865 S. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017		EXAMINER		
			NGUYEN, TRINH T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
200 1 80.000, 0			3644	
SHORTENED STATUTOR	Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVER	Y MODE
3 MONTHS		03/02/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)			
Office Action Summary		09/893,209	KIM, SONG			
		Examiner	Art Unit			
		Trinh T. Nguyen	3644			
	The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address			
Period for	· · ·		(a) an Turny (a) RAYO			
WHICH - Extensi after Si - If NO po - Failure Any rep	RTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA ons of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 X (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. eriod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period w to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, by received by the Office later than three months after the mailing patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 16(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tin iill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status			•			
1)⊠ R	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>07 Ma</u>	arch 2003.				
•		action is non-final.				
• —	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
C	losed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Dispositio	n of Claims					
- 4)⊠ C	4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-8</u> is/are pending in the application.					
•	4a) Of the above claim(s) <u>4-8</u> is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
	Claim(s) is/are allowed.	,				
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	6) Claim(s) 1.3 is/are rejected.					
7) 🗌 C	claim(s) is/are objected to.					
	claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	election requirement.	•			
Application	n Papers					
9\□ Tr	ne specification is objected to by the Examiner					
•	ne drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) acce		Examiner.			
•	Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).					
	eplacement drawing sheet(s) including the correcti					
11)[] Th	ne oath or declaration is objected to by the Exa	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority un	der 35 U.S.C. § 119					
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).					
• —	a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:					
	1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.						
30.		Johnnod Jopioo Hot, Jodoite				
Attachment(s	·)					
`	ry of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary	(PTO-413)			
2) D Notice of	of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P	ate			
	tion Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Io(s)/Mail Date	6) Other:	atent Application			

Art Unit: 3644

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serwer (US 3030696) in view of Tramont (US 5693141).

Serwer discloses a paint roller having a roller tube (15) with first and second ends, at least one end being open and an axial cavity located between first and second ends, a sponge-like member (12) comprising a flat strip of sponge-like of predetermined thickness connected to a base material (11), the strip being wound diagonally along the longitudinal axis of the roller tube, and a means (22,23,21) for rotatably connecting the roller tube to the axle.

Serwer lacks to mention that (1) the sponge-like member is a natural sponge member and (2) the base material is cotton.

Regarding 1), Tramont teaches that it is old and well known in the art of paint roller making to use either a natural or synthetic sponge member having sponge protrusions so as to apply paint to a surface in a positive design form (see lines 60-63 of col. 8, lines 1-10 of col. 9 and Figures 4 and 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced Serwer's sponge-like member with a natural sponge member, in a similar

Art Unit: 3644

manner as taught in Tramont, since using natural sponge is cheaper than synthetic sponge due to the cost of manufacturing a synthetic sponge.

Regarding 2), it is noted that Serwer teaches the use of a backing/base layer as claimed but made of a "substantially non-elastic material, such as paper of others suitable flexible non-elastic sheeting" and not of cotton. Furthermore, Applicant indicates on page 5 of the specification that "other materials can be used as the backing material, such as fabric materials other than cotton, plastic sheets and rubber, natural or synthetic". Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the specific backing/base material as claimed is a matter of design choice, wherein no significant problem is solved, or unexpected result obtained by constructing the backing/base material out of either cotton, or fabric, or plastic sheets, or rubber versus the backing/base material utilized by Serwer, since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

Response to Arguments

- 3. Applicant's arguments filed 3/7/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 4. In response to Applicant's arguments with respect to Tramont, it is noted that Tramont was relied upon to show that it is old and well known in the art of paint roller making to use either a natural or synthetic sponge member having sponge protrusions so as to apply paint to a surface in a positive design form (see lines 60-63 of col. 8, lines

Art Unit: 3644

1-10 of col. 9 and Figures 4 and 9). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced Serwer's sponge-like member with a natural sponge member, in a similar manner as taught in Tramont, since using natural sponge is cheaper than synthetic sponge due to the cost of manufacturing a synthetic sponge.

Conclusion

5. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

6. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trinh T. Nguyen whose telephone number is (571) 272-6906. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F (9:30 A.M to 6:00 P.M). The examiner's supervisor, Teri Luu can be reached on (571) 272-7045 for the purpose of status inquiry only. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 3644

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Trinh T Nguyen Primary Examiner Art Unit 3644 Page 5

3/1/07